



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,296	01/24/2002	R. Eric Montgomery	P1083US01	9773
53/096	7590	11/06/2008		
DISCUS DENTAL, LLC 8550 HIGUERA STREET CULVER CITY, CA 90232			EXAMINER JAGOE, DONNA A	
			ART UNIT 1614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/056,296

Applicant(s)

MONTGOMERY, R. ERIC

Examiner

Donna Jagoe

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 16-35, 37, 41-43, 45, 46 and 55-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 61-63 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 16-35, 37, 41-43, 45, 46 and 55-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Final Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments filed June 10, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 16-35, 37-37, 41-43, 45, 46 and 55-63 are pending in this application.

Claims 61-63 are withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 16-35, 37-39, 41-43, 45, 46 and 55-60 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 16-35, 37-39, 41-43, 45, 46 and 55-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Show Denko KK JP 62096408 in view of Pera U.S. Patent No. 4,775,525. and Parran et al. U.S. Patent No. 4684518.

The claims are drawn to a composition comprising ascorbyl-2-phosphate or a sodium or potassium salt thereof and further comprising calcium ions wherein the composition is mixed with an orally acceptable carrier, and further comprising a calcium chelating agent, a pyrophosphate, tripolyphosphate or polyphosphate tartar control agent, a water soluble fluid, water soluble solid, humectant, thickener, surfactant, sweetener, flavorant, colorant, abrasive, stabilizer, fluoride containing compound, anticaries agent, antimicrobial agent, essential oil and a desensitizing agent.

Showa Denko KK teach ascorbic acid phosphoric acid ester or it's salt (e.g. Na^+ , K^+ , Ca^{++} or Mg^+ salt) in an oral composition to be used for alveolar pyorrhea, cleaning teeth, removing bad breath and washing the teeth. It is in compositions such as toothpaste, chewing gum and troches. Working example I teaches calcium diphosphate dihydrate (source of calcium/abrasive), sodium carboxymethylcellulose and carrageenan (thickeners), glycerin (water soluble liquid), sorbitol (water soluble solid), fragrance (flavor), preservative (antimicrobial), sodium saccharin (sweetener), sodium lauryl sulfate (surfactant), and ascorbic acid magnesium phosphate.

Showa Denko does not teach the desensitizing agents of claims 40-44, it does not teach the non water-soluble solid and liquid and it does not teach the pyrophosphate, tripolyphosphate or polyphosphate tartar control agent.

Pera (4,775,525) teaches strontium as a desensitizing agent for the teeth (column 5, lines 27-43).

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time it was made to incorporate desensitizing agents and vegetable oils and wax. Such a modification would have been motivated by the reasoned expectation of producing a dentifrice composition which is effective in comprehensively cleaning teeth and desensitizing teeth of individuals that have become sensitized. Strontium is a well-known desensitizer, which is known and used in dentifrices as evidenced by the teachings of Pera (4,775,525). Vegetable oil would aid in mixing the dentifrice composition and the wax would effectively coat the teeth and add shine to the teeth.

Parran et al. teach oral compositions containing pyrophosphate salts which provide an anticalculus (aka tartar) benefit (see abstract) and teach the pyrophosphates salts useful in the invention in an amount of about 1.5% (column 2, lines 28-52) which is encompassed by the claimed 1% to about 4%.

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time it was made to incorporate the instantly recited tartar control agents. Such a modification would have been motivated by the reasoned expectation of producing a dentifrice composition, which is effective in comprehensively cleaning teeth and removing tartar. As stated in Parran et al., the pyrophosphate salts provide an anticalculus (tartar control) benefit in dentifrices (see abstract).

Applicant claims a pH of the composition from about 5.5 to about 10.0 now in independent claim 1. However, if applicant wishes to rely on provisional application

number 60/263884 ,for a priority date of 1/24/01, the only pH present in the priority document is a teaching of a pH of 8.86 in one specific formulation. There is no recitation of a pH of from about 5.5 to about 10.

See <http://pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/chemtech/95/dec/dec.html> December 1995 wherein it is recited that Sodium fluoride, sodium monofluorophosphate, and stannous fluoride are the most common fluoride sources used in toothpaste. Great care must be taken in the formulation of these agents so that their anticaries activity is not reduced by other dentifrice ingredients, such as the abrasive system. For example, whereas sodium monofluorophosphate is compatible with both silica and dicalcium phosphate dihydrate abrasives, sodium fluoride is most compatible with the silica abrasive at neutral pH values. Thus it would have been obvious to employ a pH of 5.5 to 10 since this range encompasses neutral pH's and this would be most compatible for formulations with fluoride.

Manner of amending claims

The amendment to the claims filed on June 10, 2008 does not comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121(c) because some of the status identifiers are incorrect.

Amendments to the claims filed on or after July 30, 2003 must comply with 37 CFR 1.121(c) which states:

(c) Claims . Amendments to a claim must be made by rewriting the entire claim with all changes (e.g., additions and deletions) as indicated in this subsection, except when the claim is being canceled. Each amendment document that includes a change to an existing claim, cancellation of an existing claim or addition of a new claim, must include a complete listing of all claims ever presented, including the text of all pending and withdrawn claims, in the application. The claim listing, including the text of the claims, in the amendment document will serve to replace all prior versions of the claims, in the application. In the claim listing, the status of every claim must be indicated after its claim number by using one of the following identifiers in a parenthetical expression: (Original),

(Currently amended), (Canceled), (Withdrawn), (Previously presented), (New), and (Not entered)

(1) Claim listing. All of the claims presented in a claim listing shall be presented in ascending numerical order. Consecutive claims having the same status of "canceled" or "not entered" may be aggregated into one statement (e.g., Claims 1–5 (canceled)). The claim listing shall commence on a separate sheet of the amendment document and the sheet(s) that contain the text of any part of the claims shall not contain any other part of the amendment.

(2) When claim text with markings is required. All claims being currently amended in an amendment paper shall be presented in the claim listing, indicate a status of "currently amended," and be submitted with markings to indicate the changes that have been made relative to the immediate prior version of the claims. The text of any added subject matter must be shown by underlining the added text. The text of any deleted matter must be shown by strike-through except that double brackets placed before and after the deleted characters may be used to show deletion of five or fewer consecutive characters. The text of any deleted subject matter must be shown by being placed within double brackets if strike-through cannot be easily perceived. Only claims having the

status of "currently amended," or "**withdrawn**" if also being amended, shall include markings. If a withdrawn claim is currently amended, its status in the claim listing may be identified as "withdrawn — currently amended."

(3) When claim text in clean version is required. The text of all pending claims not being currently amended shall be presented in the claim listing in clean version, i.e., without any markings in the presentation of text. The presentation of a clean version of any claim having the status of "original," "withdrawn" or "previously presented" will constitute an assertion that it has not been changed relative to the immediate prior version, except to omit markings that may have been present in the immediate prior version of the claims of the status of "withdrawn" or "previously presented." Any claim added by amendment must be indicated with the status of "new" and presented in clean version, i.e., without any underlining.

(4) **When claim text shall not be presented; canceling a claim.**

(i) **No claim text shall be presented for any claim in the claim listing with the status of "canceled" or "not entered."**

(ii) Cancellation of a claim shall be effected by an instruction to cancel a particular claim number. Identifying the status of a claim in the claim listing as "canceled" will constitute an instruction to cancel the claim.

(5) Reinstatement of previously canceled claim. A claim which was previously canceled may be reinstated only by adding the claim as a "new" claim with a new claim number.

Specifically, applicant has included the text of claims that have been cancelled, and with regard to claims 61-63, the status of these claims is incorrect. Presently the status of claims 61-63 is "withdrawn". See office action mailed January 10, 2008.

Priority

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994). The disclosure of the prior-filed application, Application No. 60/263884, fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application. For the purpose of search and examination, the priority date for claims 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 17-35, 37-37, 41-43, 45 and 46 is determined to be January 24, 2002.

Declaration

The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed June 10, 2008 is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 16-35, 37-39, 41-43, 45, 46 and 55-60 based upon insufficiency of disclosure under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph. No new matter can be added to an application after its filing date. See 35 USC § 132(a) and *Dart Industries v. Banner*, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ (CA DC 1980). The addition of a pH

other than the pH of 8.86 is considered to be new matter since applicant failed to disclose the pH ranges of 5.5-10 in the provisional application, 60/263,884; nor does the pH range in said Declaration specify 5.5-10; nor does said US provisional application 60/263,884 disclose any of the 4 Formulations cited in said Declaration.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Pera is cited to show that strontium is a well-known desensitizing agent. Applicant alleges that Pera teaches away from abrasives, generally. In response, the claims that require a desensitizing agent do not require an abrasive. For example, the abrasive agent is included in the Markush group included in instant claim 18 abrasive agents are specifically recited in instant claim 29. The desensitizing agent is included in the

Markush group in instant claim 32 with specific desensitizing agents in instant claims 41, 42 and 43. None of the claims that require a desensitizing agent require an abrasive agent. Consequently, this argument does not raise an issue of material fact.

Applicant states that "great care must be taken in the formulation of these agents so that their anticaries activity is not reduced by other dentifrice ingredients, such as the abrasive system". In response, the claims that require an anticaries agent, such as sodium monofluorophosphate do not require an abrasive. For example, the abrasive agent is included in the Markush group included in instant claim 18 abrasive agents are specifically recited in instant claim 29. The anticaries agents are included in the Markush group in instant claim 32 with specific anticaries agents in instant claims 33, 34 and 35. None of the claims that require an anticaries agent require an abrasive agent. Consequently, this argument does not raise an issue of material fact. Applicant asserts that the overlapping range of Showa Denko KK with the instant claims "does not expressly or inherently disclose a claimed range". In response, a prior art reference that discloses a range encompassing a somewhat narrower claimed range is sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (see MPEP § 2144.05 [R-5]). Regarding the pH, the neutral pH mentioned is encompassed by applicants' claimed pH of 5.5-10.

Regarding instant claim 61, this claim is not examined because it has been withdrawn from consideration in the office action dated January 10, 2008.

Regarding instant claim 55, applicant asserts that there is no teaching of an adhesion promoting agent anywhere in the cited references. In response, instant claim 55 is drawn to the inclusion in the composition of "an ingredient promoting the

adherence of the composition to the tooth or tissue, not an "adhesion promoting agent". It is not stated how long the composition will remain on the tooth. Since a thickener would help the composition remain on the tooth during brushing, it fits the claim. As anyone of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate, a watery substance would not adhere to the tooth surface during brushing, nor would it remain on the brush. However a tooth paste with thickening agents promotes the adherence of the composition to the tooth during brushing.

In view of the foregoing, when all of the evidence is considered, the totality of the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness fails to outweigh the evidence of obviousness.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donna Jagoe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0576. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Donna Jagoe /D. J./
Examiner
Art Unit 1614

November 4, 2008

/Ardin Marschel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614

